



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,382	08/28/2006	Glenn D. Prestwich	21101.0037U2	4731
23859 NEEDLE & RO	7590 02/08/2008 EDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.		. EXAMINER	
SUITE 1000			LOEWE, SUN JAE Y	
	999 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1626	
	•	•		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/552,382	PRESTWICH ET AL.	
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Sun Jae Y. Loewe	1626	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAINS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir- vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 Au</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are pendin 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-9,11,13-15,17-25,32-36,38-40,4</u> oct to restriction and/or election requirement.	vn from consideration.	1,62,64-68,71,73-75 and 77-88.	
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Secon is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) <b>l</b>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachmo-	tie)			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,6-9,11,13-15,17-25,32-36,38-40,42-44,46-48,50,51,53-55,57-59,61,62,64-68,71,73-75 and 77-88.

10/552,382 Art Unit: 1626

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a national stage application of PCT/US04/11060. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 17-25, 32-36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-55, 57-59, 61, 62, 64-68, 71, 73-75 and 77-88 are pending in the instant application. Claims 5, 10, 12, 16, 26-31, 37, 41, 45, 49, 52, 56, 60, 63, 69, 70, 72 and 76 were cancelled by preliminary amendment filed on August 28, 2006.

## Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Group I, claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 17-25, 32-36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-55, 57-59, 61, 62 and 64-67 drawn to products of formula I. Further election of a single compound is required.
- II. Group II, claim(s) 68 and 71 drawn to process of making products of Formula I. Further election of a single compound is required.
- III. Group III, claim(s) 73-75 and 77-85 drawn to process of using products of Formula I. Further election of a single compound is required.
- IV. Group IV, claim(s) 86-88 drawn to process of using products of Formula I that is different from the process of Group III. Further election of a single compound is required.
- 3. The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons.

10/552,382 Art Unit: 1626

The technical feature linking the subject matter of Groups I-IV is a phosphorus-containing compound, used for modulating LPA level. All structural features, other than the presence of a phosphorus atom, are <u>variables</u> and thus do not constitute a linking technical feature. This core structure is taught in the prior art, eg. US 6,495,532 column 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> structure.

4. This application contains Markush claims directed to more than one species. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: compounds encompassed by Formula I obtained by varying the substituents to the core structure.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no Markush claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a Markush claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed Markush claim (MPEP 803.02). If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 17-25, 32-36, 38-40, 42-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 53-55, 57-59, 61, 62, 64-68, 71, 73-75 and 77-88 encompass species described in section 4.

Application/Control Number:

10/552,382

Art Unit: 1626

Page 4

6. The species described within section 4 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the reason provided in section 3.

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species and invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention and species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

10/552,382 Art Unit: 1626

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01

Application/Control Number:

10/552,382 Art Unit: 1626 Page 6

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sun Jae Y. Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 272-9074.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SL 2-4-2008 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Rebecca Anderson Primary Examiner Art Unit 1626